

## Long-Term Panels of the German Longitudinal Election Study (GLES): Concept and Implementation

Blumenstiel, Jan Eric; Gummer, Tobias

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Arbeitspapier / working paper

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

### Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Blumenstiel, J. E., & Gummer, T. (2013). *Long-Term Panels of the German Longitudinal Election Study (GLES): Concept and Implementation*. (GESIS-Technical Reports, 2013/11). Mannheim: GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-348581>

### Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

### Terms of use:

This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

# Long-Term Panels of the German Longitudinal Election Study (GLES) Concept and Implementation

*Jan Eric Blumenstiel, Tobias Gummer*



GESIS-Technical Reports 2013|11

# Long-Term Panels of the German Longitudinal Election Study (GLES)

Concept and Implementation

*Jan Eric Blumenstiel, Tobias Gummer*

## **GESIS-Technical Reports**

GESIS – Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Postfach 12 21 55

68072 Mannheim

Telefon: (0621) 1246 - 506

Telefax: (0621) 1246 - 100

E-Mail: [tobias.gummer@gesis.org](mailto:tobias.gummer@gesis.org)

ISSN: 1868-9043 (Print)

ISSN: 1868-9051 (Online)

Herausgeber,

Druck und Vertrieb: GESIS – Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften  
Unter Sachsenhausen 6-8, 50667 Köln

## Content

---

1	Introduction .....	7
2	Long-Term Panels in German and International Election Studies .....	8
3	GLES and Component 7 .....	10
4	Design and Methodology of GLES Long-Term Panels .....	12
4.1	Study Design of the Panels.....	12
4.2	Question Program .....	14
4.3	Fieldwork .....	15
4.4	Statistics of Participants .....	23
4.5	Statistics of Interviews .....	25
4.6	Perspectives: Continuation of Long-Term Panels in 2013.....	28
5	Component 7 as Scientific Use Files (SUF).....	29
5.1	Data Cleaning and Editing.....	29
5.2	Systematics of Variables.....	31
5.3	Weighting .....	31
5.4	Data Access.....	35
6	References .....	36
7	Appendix.....	37



## 1 Introduction<sup>1</sup>

---

Within the scope of the German Longitudinal Election Study (GLES), three long-term panels are managed to date. Our approach relates to long-term panels which were started with the federal elections in 2002, 2005 and 2009. Each panel has a planned duration of three major waves for three consecutive federal elections.

Integrating these panels into the GLES project allows for the coordinated research program of the German electoral studies' long-term panels to be continued in a profound way.

This Technical Report demonstrates the common background of the long-term panels and integrates them into the context of GLES. On this basis, design and methodology of the GLES panel surveys conducted from 2009 to 2012 are described. In addition to a detailed overview of conceptual characteristics and information about fieldwork, an outlook of the planned developments of the panels from 2013 on will be provided.

In order to provide users with the greatest possible added value, the Technical Report concludes with information about data access and preparation of published data. Thereby services such as weighting and the structure of provided data sets are particularly focused on. Further information about each panel will be provided in the methodological reports which are published by GESIS for each data set and are highly recommended to be consulted previous to data analysis.

---

<sup>1</sup> This Technical Report is an extended version of Blumenstiel & Gummer (2012). We would like to thank Uta Hylla and Vivienne Brando for support in translating the text into English.



## 2 Long-Term Panels in German and International Election Studies

Repeated interviewing is a well-established method since the beginning of survey-based election studies in the United States in the 1940s and 1950s. Paul F. Lazarsfeld was one of the first to recognize the advantages of this method (in particular Lazarsfeld, 1948). The famous Erie-County-Study by Lazarsfeld and colleagues (Lazarsfeld, Berelson, & Gaudet, 1944) was conducted with seven waves during the election campaign of the American presidential election in 1940. It led not only to substantial findings which are influential to the present day, but also introduced a sophisticated design (e.g. control groups were part of the design which allowed examining panel conditioning). Therefore, this concept is still applicable with hardly any modifications to-day.

For some central questions of election studies, panel surveys are necessary or at least beneficial. Swing voting, attitude stability at the individual level, effects of newly acquired information or differences between intentions and actual behavior are best analyzed with data from repeated interviews. While the first panels were limited to a relatively short period of months, the first long-term panels were soon to be implemented, e.g. in the United States from 1956 to 1960<sup>2</sup>, in Great Britain from 1969 to 1974<sup>3</sup>, in France from 1967 to 1969<sup>4</sup>, in Canada from 1974 to 1980<sup>5</sup> or in the Netherlands from 1971 to 1979<sup>6</sup>. Central aspects of electoral science such as voting behavior in consecutive elections can only be analyzed by means of these long-term surveys. Subsequently, further long-term panels were implemented in several countries. However, compared to regular cross sectional studies, long-term panels continued to be exceptions. Possible reasons are the considerably higher administrative, financial, and temporal expenditures that go hand in hand with the implementation of repeated interviewing. The trend of decreasing response rates for face-to-face interviews and the compulsion to short-term results in many research projects made the implementation of long-term panels increasingly difficult. Therefore, in many countries long-term panels were not implemented in the recent past. However, the American National Election Study (ANES) and the British Election Study (BES) used these shifting parameters of survey research to implement long-term panels via web-based interviews for the first time (in the U.S. from 2008 to 2010<sup>7</sup>, in Great Britain from 2005 to 2010<sup>8</sup>).

The situation in Germany developed contrary to the international one. Comparatively, it took a long time until first steps were taken towards (short-term) panels in the 1970s and the 1980s (ZA635, ZA823, ZA1276, ZA1537, ZA1919). Starting with a panel survey directed by Hans Rattinger and Jürgen W. Falter from 1990 to 1992, one of the longest continuous series of long-term panels in international election studies could eventually be established. In each federal election since 1994 a new three-wave long-term panel with interviews taking place at the two consecutive federal elections was started. Within component 7 of GLES this established design was

<sup>2</sup> ANES: [http://www.electionstudies.org/studypages/anes\\_panel\\_1956to1960/anes\\_panel\\_1956to1960.htm](http://www.electionstudies.org/studypages/anes_panel_1956to1960/anes_panel_1956to1960.htm) [26.11.2012]

<sup>3</sup> BES: <http://www.esds.ac.uk/findingData/snDescription.asp?sn=422> [26.11.2012]

<sup>4</sup> French National Election Panel Study: <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/studies/2978> [26.11.2012]

<sup>5</sup> The 1974-1979-1980 Canadian National Elections and Quebec Referendum Panel Study: <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/studies/8079> [26.11.2012]

<sup>6</sup> Dutch Parliamentary Election Panel Study: <https://diva.sfsu.edu/bundles/55805> [26.11.2012]

<sup>7</sup> ANES: [http://www.electionstudies.org/studypages/2008\\_2009panel/anes2008\\_2009panel.htm](http://www.electionstudies.org/studypages/2008_2009panel/anes2008_2009panel.htm) and [http://www.electionstudies.org/studypages/2010panel\\_recontact/2010panel\\_recontact.htm](http://www.electionstudies.org/studypages/2010panel_recontact/2010panel_recontact.htm) [26.11.2012]

<sup>8</sup> BES: <http://bes.utdallas.edu/2009/panel-data0510/MEMOBES200506080910.pdf> [26.11.2012]

adopted and the 2002 and 2005 panel surveys were continued. Table 1 provides an overview of long-term panels in Germany which were concluded prior to the start of GLES in 2009.

Table 1: Long-term panels since 1990

	Panel 1990-1992		Panel A 1994-2002		Panel B 1998-2005	
Start-1 <sup>st</sup> Wave	2007 (West) 606 (East) <sup>a</sup>		4114 + 1351 <sup>b</sup>		3337	
Willingness to be re-interviewed	-		-		2629	78.8%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Wave	932 (West) 325 (East)	46.4% 53.6%	2117	51.5%	1744	52.3%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Wave	716 (West)	35.7%	1423	34.6%	691 <sup>c</sup>	20.7%
Directors	Jürgen W. Falter Hans Rattinger		Jürgen W. Falter Oskar W. Gabriel Hans Rattinger Klaus Schmitt		Hans Rattinger	
ZA-Number	ZA2429		ZA4301		ZA4662	
doi	10.4232/1.2429		10.4232/1.4301		10.4232/1.4662	

<sup>a</sup> The first wave in East Germany was implemented in 1991, parallel to the second wave in West Germany.

<sup>b</sup> From an additional mail survey, which was partially used in 1998 to increase the number of respondents.

<sup>c</sup> CATI-Interviews


### 3 GLES and Component 7

Cross-section surveys prior to and after elections are an important element of each election study. However, it is impossible to detect individual changes in voting behaviour with cross-sectional data only. A major aim of GLES is to examine long-term individual changes in political attitude and political behaviour. Therefore, panel surveys across several federal elections are necessary (Component 7 directed by Prof. Dr. Hans Rattinger).

Within the framework of GLES the long-term panels are linked to pre- and post-election cross sections (Component 1) in which each cross-section forms the first wave of a three-wave panel. The strong connection to the cross-sectional component implies that the field time of the long-term panels is identical to that of the cross-section survey. Furthermore, similar questionnaires and the same survey method (CAPI) are used for both the long-term panel and the cross-section survey.

Additionally, long-term panels are complementary with short-term campaign panels of GLES (Component 3) in terms of their content. While the latter are conducted online using an access panel and thus are not based on a fully-fledged probability-sample, the combination of short-term and long-term panel surveys within GLES offers a variety of perspectives for analysis. For example short-term electoral volatility during a campaign and long-term volatility between two elections can be studied with similar instruments.

Figure 1: German Longitudinal Election Study (GLES) 2009




Moreover, the repeated three-wave panels connect the long-term panel component of GLES with election studies of prior federal elections. Respondents of the cross-section survey of the federal election in 2002 were interviewed for the third and last time in 2009. The data of the panel from 2002 to 2009 are documented in the GESIS Data Catalogue (ZA5320) and can be downloaded free of charge. The post-election cross-section survey of 2005, which was administrated by Steffen Kühnel, Oskar Niedermayer and Bettina Westle, is also being continued (ZA4332). A data set for this panel is also available from GESIS (ZA5321) including data from 2005, 2007, 2009, and 2011. With the pre- and post-electoral cross-sections of 2009 (ZA5302), the first genuine GLES long-term panel was initiated and will be continued until the federal election of 2017.

## 4 Design and Methodology of GLES Long-Term Panels

### 4.1 Study Design of the Panels

With the long-term panel a repeated three-wave panel design is applied, which has been successfully realized for each federal election since 1994. Figure 2 illustrates this design. For each federal election, three long-term panels field in different waves.

Figure 2: Design of GLES long-term panels




With the launch of GLES this design was further improved. One drawback of the past design was the long interval between two panel-waves, which did not only reduce the correctness of addresses, but also led to the fact that many respondents did not remember their participation in the study. Therefore annual interviews were introduced, which also enhance the analytical value of the data. Table 2 compares the improved design with the previous one. A similar design was used in prior British long-term panels<sup>9</sup>. The off-election year waves are conducted in a sequential mixed mode design. The first attempt is to interview all panel participants via telephone (CATI). Second, cases who could not be contacted via phone or prefer a written participation receive a mail questionnaire.

Irrespective of the advantages of shorter intervals between data collection waves, the revised study design could induce greater panel attrition. According to Lynn (2009, p. 13), given an overall duration of a panel study, a shorter interval between waves (i.e. more waves in total) lead to higher attrition rates. However, we argue that panel attrition is a non-linear process with the highest number of refusals normally occurring between wave one and wave two (Smith, Lynn, & Elliot, 2009, p. 25). The development of the number of cases in the panel started in 2005 seems to support this notion (Figure 3). The panel has suffered from severe panel attrition, but almost

<sup>9</sup> BEPS1: [http://www.esds.ac.uk/doc/3888/mrdoc\UKDA\UKDA\\_Study\\_3888\\_Information.htm](http://www.esds.ac.uk/doc/3888/mrdoc\UKDA\UKDA_Study_3888_Information.htm) [26.11.2012]

exclusively due to losses from wave 1 to wave 2. Since 2008, the number of interviews per wave has only slightly been falling. Consequently, the advantages of the new design prevail.

Figure 3: Panel attrition in panel D (2005–2013)



The sampling for the long-term panels is carried out by pre- and post-electoral cross-section interviews (Component 1). Thus the target population of the panel established in 2009 consists of people who live in Germany, are at the age of 16 and above and live in private households in Germany, and who were entitled to vote in the German federal election on September 27<sup>th</sup> in 2009 or – if not 18 – are now entitled to vote<sup>10</sup>.

Table 2: Design of GLES long-term panels

Year	Previous Design (before 2009)	New GLES-Design (since 2009)
1	Election 1 Cross-Section (F2F, 60 Min.)	Cross-Section (F2F, 60 Min.)
2		Off-election year wave 1 (CATI/P&P, 10 Min.)
3		Off-election year wave 2 (CATI/P&P, 10 Min.)
4	Panel Maintenance (Postcard)	Off-election year wave 3 (CATI/P&P, 10 Min.)
5	Election 2 Re-Interview 1 (F2F, 60 Min.)	Major Wave 2 (F2F, 60 Min.)
6		Off-election year wave 4 (CATI/P&P, 10 Min.)
7		Off-election year wave 5 (CATI/P&P, 10 Min.)
8	Panel Maintenance (Postcard)	Off-election year wave 6 (CATI/P&P, 10 Min.)
9	Election 3 Re-Interview 2 (F2F, 60 Min.)	Major Wave 3 (F2F, 60 Min.)

<sup>10</sup> Further information on sampling is included in the study description of the pre- and post-electoral cross-section (ZA5302).

The sample population of each panel consists of the respondents of the respective baseline cross-section survey, who are willing to participate in further surveys. For instance in 2009, 2700 out of 4300 respondents (approx. 63%) were willing to be re-interviewed. The question regarding the respondent's willingness to be re-interviewed is asked at the end of the cross-sectional interview. In each wave, the respondents remain within the same survey period (pre- or post-election).

As illustrated in Table 3, the response rate of cross-sectional surveys in the past years decreased, but also the willingness to be re-interviewed diminished. This trend could for now be stopped in 2009. Appropriate measures will be taken for 2013 in order to raise the number of respondents who are willing to be re-interviewed to more than 70 percent. These measures refer to a more intensive training of the cross-section interviewers (with regard to the long-term panel) as well as improved information for the respondents.

Table 3: Sample population of long-term panels since 1998

	Panel B 1998-2005 ZA4662		Panel C 2002-2009 ZA5320		Panel D 2005-2013 ZA5321		Panel E 2009-2017 ZA5322	
Cross-section respondents	3337		3263		2540 <sup>a</sup>		4288	
Sample population (consented to be re-interviewed)	2629	78.8%	2340	71.7%	1526	60.1%	2699	63.0%

<sup>a</sup> CATI-Interviews

## 4.2 Question Program

In 2009, three different long-term panel surveys were fielded. Since the questionnaires of the respective cross-section surveys (2002, 2005, 2009) were different in some aspects, individual questionnaires were applied for each panel. Table 4 illustrates the correspondence at construct level for all waves collected in 2009. Within the framework of GLES a certain alignment of the question programs was pursued. Nevertheless the longitudinal characteristics within the separate panels should persist in order to keep their analytical potential.

Table 4: Question program of the 2009 waves on construct level by GLES long-term panels

Construct	2002 pre	2002 post	2005	2009 pre	2009 post
Evaluation of Political Actors	x	x	x	x	x
Political Attitude	x	x	x	x	x
Gender			x		
Social Attitudes					
Ego	x	x		x	x
Interest Representation by Organizations/Leading Candidates	x	x			x
Candidate for Chancellor	x	x	x	x	x

Construct	2002 pre	2002 post	2005	2009 pre	2009 post
Left-Right-Assessment	x	x	x	x	x
Use of Media and Perception of Electoral Campaign in the Media	x	x	x	x	x
Membership in Organizations	x	x	x	x	x
Personality	x	x	x	x	x
PID (Ego, Family)	x	x	x	x	x
Political Communication				x	
Political Participation	x	x		x	x
Political Interest	x	x	x	x	x
Political Knowledge	x	x	x	x	x
Position Issues (Parties and Ego)	x	x	x	x	x
Socio-Demographic Information (Ego, Partner, Parents)	x	x	x	x	x
Differences between Political Actors			x		x
Electoral Campaign (Attitudes, Perception)	x	x	x	x	x
Voting Behavior, Reason of Vote, Certainty of Decision	x	x	x	x	x
Most important Problems and Solution Expertise	x	x	x	x	x
Economic Situation Own/General/Regional	x	x	x	x	x
Satisfaction with Political Actors and Political System	x	x	x	x	x

### 4.3 Fieldwork

The fieldwork of panel surveys is subject to specific characteristics and presents extraordinary challenges to survey agencies<sup>11</sup> and researchers. Compared to the original cross-section, for instance, the panel surveys show a greater regional variance of the sample. The respondents spread beyond the originally drawn sample points due to regional mobility. This section addresses some pivotal issues of the fieldwork of GLES long-term panels

#### *Tracking Procedures*

Keeping addresses up to date is a necessary precondition for a high response rate and the avoidance of a systematic attrition of regionally mobile respondents in each panel survey. For this reason tracking procedures are regularly carried out for GLES long-term panels. Address research is accomplished in three steps. First of all, the addresses are checked visually after the cross sec-

<sup>11</sup> The fieldwork was conducted by Infratest dimap in 2009 (ZA5320 und ZA5321) and MARPLAN (ZA5322). The intermediate surveys in 2011 and early 2012 were conducted at BACES.



tion survey. If possible, information which is incomplete or implausible (e.g. four-digit zip code, obvious misspelling) is corrected by means of public sources, especially phone books. Furthermore, a duplicate control is conducted.

Second, the addresses are compared with the reference files of the Deutsche Post before the mail survey in off-election years is carried out. Thereby small mistakes can be corrected and the deliverability of the addresses can be verified in advance.

Third, the addresses of those respondents who could not be reached for an interview either in written form or by phone are investigated by Address Research<sup>12</sup>, a subsidiary of the Deutsche Post. In a first step, this investigation is conducted with a bereavement and relocation database. In a second step, it is conducted by requests to authorized registration offices.

Table 5: Address comparison with reference file in March, 2011

	Panel D 2005-2013 ZA5321		Panel E 2009-2017 ZA5322	
Subject Deliverable	190	41.4%	609	35.3%
Household Deliverable	50	10.9%	312	18.1%
Subject unknown, Building known	88	19.2%	521	30.2%
Subject and Building unknown	9	2.0%	48	2.8%
Subject not Deliverable	83	18.1%	131	7.6%
Household not Deliverable	29	6.3%	66	3.8%
Not ascertainable	10	2.2%	36	2.1%
Total	459	100%	1723	100%

The results of the address research shall be illustrated with the investigations in fall 2010 and early 2011. With the visual control a great number of small mistakes (especially incorrect street names, e.g. Eichendorfstr. instead of Eichendorffstr.) were eliminated, and approximately 600 new phone numbers were detected (personal and household level). After the cross-section surveys in 2009 approximately 1,300 phone numbers of respondents who were willing to be re-interviewed were missing. With manual research this gap was reduced to 700. The results of the address verification by means of the reference file and the research conducted by Address Research are summarized in Table 6.

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.adress-research.de/>


Table 6: Address comparison via Address Research (Relocation and Bereavement Database and requests to the Registration Office) April, 2011

	Panel D 2005-2013 ZA5321		Panel E 2009-2017 ZA5322	
Subject Deceased	9	10.8%	14	11.1%
New Address	66	79.5%	96	76.2%
Still Registered but no longer Residing	4	4.8%	7	5.6%
Unknown/Not Registered, Other	4	4.8%	9	7.1%

While these reactive tracking procedures thus proved to be quite successful, they should be accompanied by pro-active measures to reduce the number of addresses which need tracking. The most important pro-active tool is interviewer training. Interviewers must be aware of the importance of correctly recorded addresses. Even small, seemingly unimportant deviations such as "Mathias Meier" instead of "Matthias Maier" can be crucial to the success of tracking procedures since only addresses which once have been valid can be successfully tracked. Interviewers should especially be trained for the so-called corner house problem. In many places, the street name of a given house is not self-explanatory, sometimes even contra-intuitive as Figure 4 illustrates. In these cases the interviewers could easily record a wrong street. The misclassifications later can only be identified by visual inspection of city maps, automated tracking procedures will fail.

Another pro-active tool is the distribution of postcards to the respondents. If their address changes in the future, the respondents can send the pre-directed and stamped postcard back. Such postcards have been sent to all panel respondents together with the pre-notification of the off-election year wave in autumn 2012.

Figure 4: The corner house problem



### *Incentives*

While the effect of incentives on response rates is rather small, most panel surveys use incentives in some way. The reason is that in panel surveys even a little reduction of attrition can be worth a rather high effort. For another, the participation in panel studies is always more time-consuming for the respondents, so that researchers may want to appreciate the effort that the respondents accept with their repeated participation.

All panel respondents receive an incentive for their participation. For off-election year surveys a reward of 5 Euros is granted, for election year face-to-face surveys the reward amounts to 10 Euros. For the 2011 and 2012 waves the respondents could choose between an Amazon voucher and a lottery ticket. In 2011 an alternative option was to donate the reward to UNICEF. While other studies reported higher response rates in subsequent wave for respondents who donated their incentives (possibly as an effect of a general tendency to altruistic behavior, see Laurie & Lynn, 2009; Lengacher, Sullivan, Couper, & Groves, 1995), we did not observe such an effect.

### *Field Times*

In Table 7 the field times are illustrated for the major survey in 2009 as well as for the intermediate surveys in 2011 and 2012. As a result of some individual laggards, the field times of the mail intermediate surveys are quite long. In contrast to the usual approach of a mail cross-section survey, field time does not end after a pre-determined period of time but theoretically lasts until the beginning of the following wave.

### *Cover Letter, Brochures and Reminder*

All panel surveys are announced about one week prior to start of the fieldwork by postcard or letter. These announcements provide information about the duration and the mode of the survey. Furthermore a phone number and an e-mail address are indicated for possible requests and the respondents are referred to a respondent homepage for further information.

For the mail surveys the respective respondents receive an invitation letter, a short brochure about the survey with several findings and notes regarding data protection, a questionnaire, a separate address sheet and a stamped addressed envelope.

Other than for cross section mail surveys, only one reminder is sent because negative effects regarding the willingness to cooperate in future surveys shall be avoided. Too much contact may be conceived as interfering.

The advance and cover letters as well as the reminder of the 2011 panel wave are attached to this Technical Report.

Table 7: Field times of GLES panel surveys since 2009

Year	Panel	Mode	Field Time
2009	ZA5320	CAPI	pre election: 08/06/09-09/09/25 post election: 10/02/09-12/14/09
2009	ZA5321	CAPI	pre election: 08/06/09-09/09/25 post election: 10/02/09-12/14/09
2009	ZA5322	CAPI	pre election: 08/10/09-09/26/09 post election: 09/28/09-11/23/09
2011	ZA5321	CATI	01/04/11-03/18/11
2011	ZA5322	CATI	01/04/11- 03/18/11
2011	ZA5321	MAIL	05/10/11- 10/21/11
2011	ZA5322	MAIL	05/10/11- 10/21/11
2011	ZA5322	CATI	10/06/11- 11/17 /11
2011/12	ZA5322	MAIL	11/22/11- 03/15/12
2011/12	ZA5322	WEB	11/22/11- 01/04/12
2012	ZA5321	CATI	02/22/12 – 03/26./12
2012	ZA5321	MAIL	04/02/12 – 06/15/12

*Interviewer Training*

For each major and intermediate survey the appointed interviewers receive in-person training. Thereby the background and the characteristic features of long-term panels as well as the questionnaires of the survey are explained. The correct identification of the subject and a precise record of reasons for drop-out are particularly focused on.

*Number of Cases and Response Rates*

The tables below illustrate the number of cases and the response rates for the panel surveys since the beginning of GLES in 2009. The number of cases of the major waves corresponding to the respective federal elections is described in Table 8. The 2002 panel was concluded in 2009; 436 respondents have participated in each of the three election-year surveys of this panel.

Table 8: Number of cases, major waves since 2002

	Panel C 2002-2009 ZA5320		Panel D 2005-2013 ZA5321		Panel E 2009-2017 ZA5322
1 <sup>st</sup> Major Wave	2340		1526 <sup>c</sup>		2699
2 <sup>nd</sup> Major Wave	902 <sup>b</sup>	38.5%	686	45.0%	
3 <sup>rd</sup> Major Wave	641	27.4%			

Percentages refer to the sample population of a given long-term panel.

<sup>b</sup> CATI-Interviews (Change of mode necessary due to early federal election)

<sup>c</sup> Post-election cross-section only

Table 9 illustrates the number of cases for each panel survey since 2009. In the panel started in 2005 the number of cases in the intermediate surveys in 2011 and 2012 account for approximately 90 percent of the number of cases of the previous wave. The same percentage could be achieved for the intermediate wave of the panel started in 2009. However, in spring 2011 a notably higher attrition was recorded as this was the first re-interview after the cross section interview in 2009 and not all addresses of those respondents who were willing to be re-interviewed were available. For the 2005 panel 409 individuals have participated in each of the three waves since 2009. In the 2009 panel 723 individuals have participated in each wave.

Corresponding to the sequential mixed-mode-design, a majority of the intermediate interviews were conducted via telephone. The mail surveys help to reach individuals who lacked time for a telephone interview, and those who refuse telephone interviews as a matter of principle. Additionally, many respondents whose phone number was yet unknown were willing to mention it in a written interview.

Table 9: Panel survey modes since 2009

Panel	Year	CAPI	CATI	MAIL	WEB	Total	In % of the sample population	
ZA5320	2009	641				641	27.4%	
ZA5321	2009	686				686	45.0%	
	2011		491	114	-	605	88.2%	39.6%
	2012		459	87	-	546	90.2%	35.4%
ZA5322	2009	2699				2699	100%	
	2011		697	288	-	985	36.5%	36.5%
	2011/2		645	217	22	884	89.7%	32.8%

An overview of results and response rates according to AAPOR-standard is provided in Table 10. In order to apply the coding to panel surveys, all entries relate to the contact information of the respective interview (address or phone number), not to the target person itself. The target person Max Mustermann is always part of the panel-sample. However, if a call reveals the phone number known for this person is not assigned anymore, the final disposition code would be **not eligible**. In order to determine the disposition codes of the intermediate surveys with the mixed-mode-design, the recommendation of AAPOR was followed that the result of the interviewer-administered mode is to be considered final (in this case: CATI), except the self-administered mode reveals a result with higher information content. For instance, a mail interview substitutes the previous disposition code in any case.

The **interview** category refers to all conducted and completed interviews, i.e. it is not distinguished between completed interviews and partial interviews exceeding a given item nonresponse threshold. The **refusal/dropout** category refers to both hard and soft refusals as well as refusals through a contact person. Additionally, for mail surveys it refers to questionnaires which were returned blank. **No contact** implies that the subject could not be found at the indicated address or not be reached under the known phone number. **Unknown eligibility** (off-election year surveys only) means, for example, that merely a dialing tone appeared under the indicated phone number or that every written attempt of contact was not responded to. The category **unknown, other** (off-election year surveys only) refers to undeliverable questionnaires for mail surveys and to persons who could not be identified precisely as the target person in telephone interviews. The category **other** particularly contains decedents or individuals who could not be interviewed for health reasons. Those addresses and phone numbers, by which the subjects could not be reached, were classified as **not eligible**.

The response and cooperation rates are calculated as follows (AAPOR, 2011: 44-47):

- Response Rate 2 (RR2) =  $\frac{I+P}{I+P+R+NC+O+UH+UO}$
- Response Rate 6 (RR6) =  $\frac{I+P}{I+P+R+NC+O}$
- Cooperation Rate 2 (COOP2) =  $\frac{I+P}{I+P+R+O}$
- Cooperation Rate 4 (COOP4) =  $\frac{I+P}{I+P+R}$

Table 10: Results of fieldwork and response rates since 2009

Code	Description	Panel C		Panel D		Panel E	
		2002-2009		2005-2013		2009-2017	
		ZA5320		ZA5321		ZA5322	
		2009	2009	2011	2012	2011	2012
I/P	Interview	641	686	604	546	990	883
R	Refusal/Dropout	474	388	165	117	572	349
NC	No Contact	96	102	52	37	133	86
UH	Unknown Validity	0	0	24	104	378	454
UO	Unknown, Other	0	0	10	26	110	80
O	Other	210	140	10	3	47	36
NE	Invalid	118	149	221	64	361	138
RR2	Response Rate (min)	45.1%	52.1%	69.8%	65.6%	44.4%	46.8%
RR6	Response Rate (max)	45.1%	52.1%	72.7%	77.7%	56.8%	65.2%
COOP2	Cooperation (min)	48.3%	56.5%	77.5%	82.0%	61.5%	69.6%
COOP4	Cooperation (max)	57.5%	63.9%	78.5%	82.4%	63.4%	71.7%

The address stock is summarized in Table 11 (as of August 2012). Not all persons with address status A have participated in the intermediate surveys in 2011 and 2012. However, at least one contact information was verified.

For respondents with address status B neither a valid address nor phone number could be detected in spite of several attempts of contact and research, or an address or phone number was valid in 2011 but no longer in 2012. As a result, these individuals can only be considered for future surveys if a new address can be determined. If tracking does not succeed within two years the respective individual is counted as panel drop-out.

For individuals with address status C usually a first name is missing or only available as initial. During the phone surveys in 2011 and 2012, the year of birth was used for these respondents to be identified and the missing information to be completed. In the 2009 panel this approach succeeded in approximately 30 cases. Thus the remaining individuals with this address status are omitted in future surveys as tracking is impossible without a full name.

Individuals with address status D are either deceased or have refused "hard" in a previous survey, i.e. they have refused participation in the current and further panel surveys. Consequently, they will no longer be contacted. This does not refer to individuals who have refused "soft" in a single wave (i.e. due to health or scheduling reasons).

Table 11: Address inventory (in August, 2012)

Status	Description	Panel D 2005–2013 ZA5321	Panel E 2009–2017 ZA5322
A	Address and/or Phone Number Effective	768	1701
B	Address and Phone Number not Effective	120	416
C	Name Incomplete	35	75
D	Drop-outs due to Refusals or Bereavements	166	505

#### 4.4 Statistics of Participants

The most important socio-demographic distributions for panels ZA5320, ZA5321 and ZA5322 are illustrated below showing the first and current wave (2009), respectively. For ZA5322 only the first wave is recorded. The results are unweighted in order to illustrate the actual sample. For weighting, please refer to section 5.3 of this Technical Report.

The marginal distribution for the region in which the interview was conducted clearly shows the intended East-oversampling for each of the three panels. For ZA5320, a low willingness to be re-interviewed in East Germany leads to a reduced amount of East Germans in the sample. However the proportion remains largely stable for ZA5321. For better comparability, Berlin is attributed to East Germany for this analysis.

Table 12: Distribution of respondents on East and West Germany

Region	Panel C 2002–2009 ZA5320				Panel D 2005–2013 ZA5321				Panel E 2009–2017 ZA5322	
	Wave 2002		Wave 2009		Wave 2005		Wave 2009		Wave 2009	
East	1072	32.85%	156	24.34%	877	34.53%	253	36.88%	1526	35.59%
West	2191	67.15%	485	75.66%	1663	65.47%	433	63.12%	2762	64.41%
Total	3263	100%	641	100%	2540	100%	686	100%	4288	100%

The gender distributions of panel ZA5320 and ZA5321 show a rather homogenous proportion between male and female respondents. With a difference of 12.52 percentage points (ZA5320) and 5.24 percentage points (ZA5321), respectively, women are under-represented in the subsequent waves.




Table 13: Distribution respondent's gender

Sex	Panel C 2002-2009 ZA5320				Panel D 2005-2013 ZA5321				Panel E 2009-2017 ZA5322	
	Wave 2002		Wave 2009		Wave 2005		Wave 2009		Wave 2009	
Male	1655	50,77%	361	56,32%	1259	49,57%	361	52,62%	2060	48,04%
Female	1605	49,23%	280	43,8%	1281	50,43%	325	47,38%	2228	51,96%
Total	3260	100%	641	100%	2540	100%	686	100%	4288	100%

Figure 3 illustrates the kernel density estimation for the age distribution of the panels' first waves. The distributions are quite similar for participants older than 70; the same applies for an age up to 25. Variation appears in between. The 2002 sample shows a bimodal distribution with two local maxima at 40 and 60 years. However, the 2005 sample's mode is at 45 years and the 2009's mode at 70 years.

In 2009, the distribution is smoother even in the range of 40 to 70 years with a mode less remarkable than for the other panels. The mean age of all three panels is 50 years for the first wave. Accordingly, the vertical lines, which complement the kernel density estimation with the mean, are overlapping.

Figure 3: Kernel density of age distribution, first waves



The age distribution for the current waves of panel ZA5320 and ZA5321 are illustrated in Figure 4. Furthermore the distribution, as described for the first wave, is shown after attrition. Note that respondents of panel ZA5320 have already participated for seven years and thus aged. Respondents of panel ZA5321 have only participated for four years. Hence, the density curve for ZA5320 is shifted to the right. As can be seen for the first waves, there would be an overlap if this disparity was corrected for. According to the varying ageing, the means between the last waves of the panels diverge. The latter is illustrated with vertical lines.

Figure 4: Kernel density of age distribution, current waves




Table 14 illustrates the distribution of educational qualification for the first and the current wave of each GLES long-term panel. For ZA5322 only the first wave can be shown. The findings indicate a high attrition in the categories “Secondary School” and “Middle School” whereas the share of respondents with “Higher Education” increases in the current waves. The same rank order applies to the first waves of each panel: the highest share of respondents is in the category “Secondary School”, followed by “Middle School” and respondents with “Higher Education”.

Table 14: Distribution of educational qualifications

Highest Level of Education	Panel C				Panel D				Panel E	
	2002-2009				2005-2013				2009-2017	
	ZA5320				ZA5321				ZA5322	
	Wave 2002		Wave 2009		Wave 2005		Wave 2009		Wave 2009	
Secondary School	1384	42.97%	246	38.56%	955	37.75%	182	26.57%	1813	42.52%
Middle School	980	30.43%	179	28.06%	849	33.56%	248	36.20%	1505	35.30%
Higher Education	795	24.68%	203	31.82%	710	28.06%	254	37.08%	894	20.97%
Other	62	1.92%	10	1.57%	16	0.63%	1	0.15%	52	1.22%
Total	3221	100%	638	100%	2530	100%	685	100%	4264	100%

## 4.5 Statistics of Interviews

In this section the interview situation is described, based on characteristics of the interviewer and the interview. For ZA5321 no interviewer-ID is available for the first wave. For this reason the statistics of interviewers are not adjusted for those interviewers who have conducted multiple interviews. The latter need to be interpreted as interviews which were conducted by an interview-

er with specific characteristics, i.e. statistics of interviews are reported here, not statistics of interviewers. This seems to be necessary in order to ensure comparability of the statistics in this report. There is no information available on interviewers and the interview situation for ZA5322.

Compared to the overall gender distribution of the interviewers, male interviewers prevail. All examined panel waves show that more interviews were conducted by male interviewers than by female interviewers. This effect is even more pronounced for both waves of 2009.

**Table 15: Gender distribution of interviewers**

Sex of Interviewer	Panel C 2002-2009 ZA5320				Panel D 2005-2013 ZA5321			
	Wave 2002		Wave 2009		Wave 2005		Wave 2009	
Male	1861	57.03%	408	63.65%	1352	53.23%	479	69.83%
Female	1402	42.97%	233	36.35%	1188	46.77%	207	30.17%
Total	3263	100%	641	100%	2540	100%	686	100%

The age distribution of the interviewers, without controlling for multiple interviews, is illustrated for the first and current wave as kernel density estimation in Figure 5 (ZA5320) and Figure 6 (ZA5321). Compared to the first wave, both panels have a higher interviewer age in 2009. Accordingly, the means vary for each wave of the respective panel. The latter also indicate higher values for the current wave.

**Figure 5: Kernel density of age distribution of interviewers (ZA5320)**




Figure 6: Kernel density of age distribution of Interviewers (ZA5321)




Table 16 illustrates the educational qualification of the interviewers for each interview situation. In both panels a trend towards a rank order of relative frequency is evident: more interviewers have a middle school degree than a higher education degree, interviewers with a secondary school degree come last. This trend is evident from 2002 to 2005 and in 2009. However, the values for both 2009 waves level off at a similar level.

Table 16: Educational qualification of interviewers

Highest Level of Education	Panel C 2002-2009 ZA5320				Panel D 2005-2013 ZA5321			
	Wave 2002		Wave 2009		Wave 2005		Wave 2009	
Secondary School	693	21.60%	115	17.94%	492	19.37%	109	15.89%
Middle School	1239	38.61%	325	50.70%	1117	43.98%	329	47.96%
Higher Education	1277	39.79%	201	31.36%	931	36.65%	248	36.15%
Total	3209	100%	641	100%	2540	100%	686	100%

Due to corresponding variables, the interview situation of the different panel waves can be compared. Thereby, both the presence of third persons during the interview and an intervention of these persons in the interview are described. In up to 20% of the first-wave interviews third persons were present during the interview. In 2009 this amount is reduced by half to 11.1% and 7.6%, respectively. In about 30% of the interview conducted in the first waves, an intervention by these further present individuals took place. In the following waves the amount decreases by 8.8 percentage points and 6.5 percentage points, respectively.

In wave 2005 of panel ZA5321, in 25 cases interviewers reported that they were alone with the respondent but were disturbed by intervening third persons. One possible explanation could be short visits of other persons at the door who were not defined as present by the interviewer. For the other waves this kind of coding was being prevented by filtering.

Table 17: Overview of interview situation

Interview Situation	Panel C 2002-2009 ZA5320		Panel D 2005-2013 ZA5321	
	Wave 2002	Wave 2009	Wave 2005	Wave 2009
Further individuals present during interview?	21.24%	11.08%	21.02%	7.58%
Intervention of those individuals into interview?	38.42%	29.58%	31.46%	25.00%

#### 4.6 Perspectives: Continuation of Long-Term Panels in 2013

The 2012 off-election year wave fielded from October 2012 to January 2013. As from this survey respondents of the 2005 and 2009 panel receive consistent questionnaires. For respondents who were first interviewed in 2005 this causes minor discontinuities in the questionnaires between the panel waves as those questions from the 2005 cross-section which were not part of the 2009 cross-section will no longer be collected. However, the comparability between the two panels increases. Due to the early elections in 2005, which only allowed for a post-election cross-section, the final number of cases was considerably lower in the 2005 cross section. As a consequence, the number of cases in the 2005 panel decreased to less than 700 respondents in 2009 already. Due to the low number of cases, independent analyses with this panel would only be possible to a limited extent. Thus a conformation to the 2009 panel, in terms of content, seemed plausible. In doing so, respondents from both panels can be analyzed jointly if the year of initial participation is irrelevant. For separate analysis, the year of the first wave will be included in published data sets.

As well as in all previous election year surveys (apart from 2005), face-to-face interviews (CAPI) will be conducted prior to and after the Bundestag elections in September 2013. The questionnaire for the approximately one-hour interview will correspond in large parts to the cross-section questionnaire of 2009. However, a 1:1-correspondence is not aimed for. Questions with a specific reference to the federal elections of 2009 could as well be omitted as questions which are not included in the panel due to content wise considerations. For instance, the quite extensive social demographics of the 2009 cross-section will be shortened for the re-interviews. Likewise decisions need to be made about the possible adjustment of questions which were collected differently for pre-election and post-election in 2009. To a very limited extent, new questions will be included into the questionnaire. First of all this concerns questions with a specific reference to the federal elections in 2013 and secondly those questions which can only be posed during the re-interview (e.g. questions referring to changes in 2009). Third, it concerns modifications which are adopted from the 2013 cross-section and finally questions, which result from findings of research with data from earlier panel waves.

## 5 Component 7 as Scientific Use Files (SUF)

---

The open-source policy of GLES requires that the data need to be made available for the scientific community in an appropriate way (Schmitt-Beck, Rattinger, Roßteutscher, & Weßels, 2010). Within the cooperation between GLES and GESIS the preparation, documentation and archiving of the data is carried out by the research data centre Wahlen (FDZ Wahlen) at GESIS. The archived data sets are provided as Scientific Use File (SUF). During the data preparation critical variables and indications are eliminated to achieve a factual anonymization. These variables are made available for users who sign a user's contract or at the GESIS Safe Data Center.

In order to service international requests, the key components of GLES are provided as English distributions. This service includes the long-term panels of GLES. Therefore, data set, questionnaire documentation and study description are translated. Modifications in the data sets are limited to variable and value labels, apart from that, the data sets are identical for both language versions.

### 5.1 Data Cleaning and Editing

Data cleaning and editing of the long-term panels is carried out in accordance to a principle of minimal-invasive editing. Non-critical errors in the data are usually marked with flag-variables. For example in the "mutant examination" no cases were deleted but marked in a respective variable. Respondents are considered "mutants" if not the target person of the initial wave but another person was interviewed in a follow up wave, e.g. the spouse.

The preparation is carried out by waves. Therefore a first version of the data sets is created as soon as wave 1 of the panel is available. Each new wave is added to these data sets.

#### *Panel Mutants*

To identify cases of panel mutation the variables gender, year of birth and month of birth are compared for two main waves of a long-term panel. Following a predefined set of rules every case with individual change on these variables is declared an invalid case. Invalid cases are re-interviewed to confirm the former interview and correct the data, if a measurement error occurred. If the wrong person was interviewed in a follow up wave the case is flagged.

Rules for identification of panel mutation are as follows:

- Different gender → invalid case
- Different birth year & different birth month → invalid case
- Different birth month → valid case
- Different birth year → difference < 5 → valid case  
difference > 5 → invalid case

The method described above was first used during the data cleaning and editing of long-term panel 2005ff (ZA5321). In 25 cases interviews mutation was detected and further investigated. Of all 25 cases 6 were confirmed as factual interviews. The remaining 19 cases (2.8% of all cases participating 2005 & 2009) are flagged using the variable "mutation."

### Format of Data Set

In the context of panel surveys two data set formats can be distinguished: long and wide. In the long-format each data row describes a point of time for each respondent and is called a spell. For each respondent  $t$  data rows are created where  $t$  is the amount of the respondent's individual participation in waves. By contrast, a data row in wide-format describes a complete case; each variable is filed in its time-specific variety.

There are three reasons for the use of the wide-format within the GLES panels. First of all, with the wide-format it is possible to conduct simple (descriptive) analyses. This is partly impossible with the long-format. Second, this lowers the initial burden for statistically less experienced users. Third, long-term panels are panels with greater intervals between the waves which sometimes make adjustments necessary (e.g. in terms of context of time, to questions and scales). However, a long-format requires the same scaling of a question. Compare Figure 7 an illustration of wide and long format.

Figure 7: Panel data in long and wide-format

"long"			"wide"			
id	time	v10	id	a10	b10	c10
1	1	1	1	1	1	0
1	2	1	2	1	1	1
1	3	0	...	...	...	...
2	1	1				
2	2	1				
2	3	1				
...	...	...				

### Missing Values

Compared to cross-section components, long-term panels face complex missing structures. After adding several waves it becomes necessary to not only distinguish between missings due to filtering and splits but also missings due to participation only in a subset of waves. For this reason a more differentiated coding scheme is used which is illustrated in Table 18. For variables with great scales the coding is shifted to higher levels, for example, like 9998.

Table 18: Missing value coding scheme

Code	Reason for Missing Value
8	Don't know
9	No answer
100	Filter
101	Split
102	Wave
103	Indefinite, Residual Category

## 5.2 Systematics of Variables

The definition of a variable in wide format is usually a combination of two parts: prefix and stem. The prefix serves as wave indicator, the stem as question indicator. This way, for instance, variable “a10” is identifiable as question “10” conducted in wave “a”.

Both the allocation of prefix and stem for GLES long-term panels is aligned to the long-term panels 1994ff (ZA4301) and 1998ff (ZA4662). With the first wave of panel 1994ff, the prefixes start in alphabetical and ascending order with “a”. Table 19 illustrates the classification for all published waves to date.

With the accumulation of the panels within GLES it was decided to publish surveys for panel maintenance in order to access further possibilities of analysis. In the systematics of variables, the off-year election waves received own prefixes which fit the alphabetical order. This modification starts in 2007 for the intermediate survey of panel ZA5321 and continues in the intermediate surveys of the 2011 and 2012 panel waves.

Table 19: Prefixes of variable names

Year	1994	1998	2002	2005	2007	2009	2011	2012	2013
Prefix	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i

For the stem of the variable name the same questions and constructs are indicated with the same label. Regarding the various waves and panels there is a high level of congruence. However, several smaller adjustments took place which lead to diverse scales and slightly differing questions within the same stem name. In this respect, the adherence of the longitudinal consistency was found the most important motive. Cases of this kind are evident from the questionnaire documentation. For an overview of various constructs within the long-term panels compare Table 4.

## 5.3 Weighting

Several weighting factors are attached to the data sets of the long-term panels and are supposed to correct for various biases. There are design, adjustment and panel weights. Partially the weights are combined. This provides the user with the possibility to decide which weights to use for analyses.

In the random sampling of the start waves of long-term panels, East Germany is intentionally overrepresented. To control for the latter, an East-West weight is calculated (e.g. Gabler & Ganninger, 2010). In ZA5320 the weighting factor is 0.688 for East Germans and 1.153 for West Germans.

Due to the sampling design of the long-term panels the probability to be interviewed is higher for people living in large households so that additional transformation weights are attached to the data set as design weights. This correction factor is calculated as:  $w_t = \frac{1}{n_{hh}}$ , where  $n_{hh}$  is the amount of people living in the household. In ZA5320 the maximum weighting factor is at 3.96 and the minimum at 0.44. The 5% percentile is 0.44 and the 95% percentile is 1.76.

Adjustment weights are referred to if weighting factors are adjusted to a distribution which is not matched with the sample. The German Microcensus serves as reference distribution for GLES



long-term panels for the respective years. The adjustment is carried out by means of five characteristics: sex (2 categories), education (3 categories), age (4 categories), region (2 categories), BIK-municipal size (3 categories). The method of “iterative proportional fitting” (IPF) was applied for determining the weighting factors. It was calculated with STATA by use of the Ado “ipfweight”<sup>13</sup>. The weights are provided in two forms. First, in combination with the transformation weight described above and second, without the transformation weight. The East-West design weight is integrated in both weights. Table 20 illustrates descriptives of the adjustment weights for the 2002 long-term panel.

**Table 20: Adjustment weights in ZA5320**

	IPF-weight, with transformation weight	IPF-weight, without transformation weight
Min.	0.1576	0.2751
Max.	4.5129	2.0284
5% Percentile	0.3463	0.4615
95% Percentile	2.0666	1.6889

Furthermore, panel weights were created in order to control for selective panel attrition. For this purpose a model was fitted employing logistic regression to explain participation in a later wave of the panel. For modeling information from wave 1 is used for respondents of wave 2. Using the estimates of the model, individual participation probabilities are predicted which serve as weighting factors in inverted form. This method is called Propensity Score Weighting. Thus the (individual) panel weight equals:  $w_p = \frac{1}{P(Y=1|X)}$ , where:  $(Y = 1|X) = \frac{e^x}{1+e^x}$ .

In a further step the weights are adjusted to the marginal distributions of the German Microcensus by means of IPF.

As the probability of further participation cannot be estimated for wave 1, the adjustment weight is used as panel weight for this first wave.

Truncated cases and item nonresponse are problematic for the method summarized above. If item nonresponse occurs in variables used for modeling, no participation probability can be predicted for the respective cases. To tackle this problem two strategies were applied. For variables for which item nonresponse was considered uncritical for modeling the affected cases were coded into the modal or reference category. If this procedure was assumed to be inappropriate, the model was estimated without the affected cases. Subsequently, the panel weight was imputed with the average weighting factors of the sample.

In case of truncation in wave 2, the participation probability for wave 3 cannot be estimated on the basis of information from wave 2. For affected cases the previous weighting factor is imputed. Descriptives of the panel weights in ZA5320 are given in Table 21.

<sup>13</sup> “ipfweight” was created by Michael Bergmann and is available at <http://ideas.repec.org/c/boc/bocode/s457353.html> or via STATA Ado-Search.

Table 21: Panel-weights in ZA5320

	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 3
Min.	0.2751	0.1311	0.0358
Max.	2.0284	10.4275	6.1227
5% Percentile	0.4615	0.2375	0.1764
95% Percentile	1.6888	2.4569	2.3547
N	3,263	902	641

As common in other studies (Kroh & Spieß, 2008; Lipps, 2007; Trappmann, 2011), several socio-demographic and substantial variables were used for estimating. Based on this model, the likelihood of further participation can be estimated for each respondent and consequently the panel weighting factor can be calculated. Table 22 illustrates the estimated model for wave 2 and 3 of the 2002-2005-2009 long-term panel.

Table 22: Logistic regressions on participation in re-interview, Wave 2005 and 2009

	Wave 2005 logit / se	Wave 2009 logit / se
Female	0.1207 (0.0957)	-0.2955 (0.1586)
Age: 30-39	-0.791* (0.3801)	0.2037 (1.2962)
Age: 40-49	0.4121* (0.1664)	0.9353** (0.3343)
Age: 50-59	0.5415** (0.171)	1.2264*** (0.3369)
Age: 60+	0.3139 (0.2218)	0.698 (0.4007)
Education: Intermediate	0.2959** (0.1065)	-0.2045 (0.1821)
Education: High	0.3048* (0.1349)	0.1738 (0.2459)
East Germany	-0.4296*** (0.0941)	-0.2733 (0.1623)
Occupation: Housewife/Homemaker	-0.5492** (0.2108)	0.2911 (0.3808)
Occupation: Pensioner	0.0346 (0.1688)	0.2737 (0.2555)

	Wave 2005 logit / se	Wave 2009 logit / se
Marital Status: Married	0.3472*** (0.0938)	-0.1046 (0.1598)
Members of Household > 5	0.4255* (0.1849)	0.3478 (0.3005)
Intention to vote	0.2442* (0.1225)	0.5092 (0.3566)
Disenchantment with Political Parties	-0.0348 (0.1087)	-0.1218 (0.1718)
Indecision Chancellor Preference	-0.0603 (0.1333)	-0.1844 (0.1879)
Political Knowledge	0.2441** (0.0859)	0.0421 (0.1473)
Political Interest: Low	0.5*** (0.1208)	0.887** (0.2772)
Political Interest: High	1.0484*** (0.1277)	0.8556** (0.2826)
Index Item Nonresponse	-1.3642** (0.478)	-1.8949 (1.1095)
Female * Age: 30-39	0.4803* (0.2373)	0.4318 (0.4963)
Education: High * Age: 60+	0.4387* (0.2046)	0.3389 (0.318)
Age: 30-39 * Intention to vote	0.6035 (0.364)	-0.4164 (1.2574)
Constant	-2.4532*** (0.1986)	-1.9302*** (0.5136)
N	3,193	895
McFadden's adj. R <sup>2</sup>	0.069	0.023
* p<0,05, ** p<0,01, *** p<0,001		

## 5.4 Data Access

All data sets are available online at the GESIS Data Catalogue (DBK). The archive can be browsed with promoted search mechanisms and the Digital Object Identifier (DOI). Registered users may download the archived data sets free of charge.

Sensible data which is not included in SUF data sets is thus not available for download. This data can be provided per user agreement or on-site usage in a Safe-Data-Center at GESIS.

In case of revision, the centralization of data provision at FDZ Wahlen allows for updated versions of the data sets to be made available without making reproduction impossible. In this case a new DOI is assigned. In this way it is possible to refer to the actually used version of a data set in one reference even if a data set was revised more than once.


Furthermore a homogenous documentation can be ensured by the central service of the FDZ. Within GLES a consistent documentation of questionnaires and methods is provided. The latter helps users to become used to different GLES data sets faster. Thus the inhibition level to use multiple components for analyses is lowered.

## 6 References

---

- AAPOR. (2011). *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys. 7th edition*: The American Association for Public Opinion Research.
- Blumenstiel, J. E., & Gummer, T. (2012). Langfrist-Panels der German Longitudinal Election Study (GLES): Konzeption, Durchführung, Aufbereitung und Archivierung. *GESIS Technical Reports*, 11.
- Gabler, S., & Ganninger, M. (2010). Gewichtung. In C. Wolf & H. Best (Eds.), *Handbuch der sozialwissenschaftlichen Datenanalyse* (pp. 143-164). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Kroh, M., & Spieß, M. (2008). Documentation of Sample Sizes and Panel Attrition in the German Socio Economic Panel (SOEP) (1984 until 2007). *Data Documentation, DIW Berlin*, 39.
- Laurie, H., & Lynn, P. (2009). The Use of Respondent Incentives on Longitudinal Surveys. In P. Lynn (Ed.), *Methodology of Longitudinal Surveys* (pp. 205-233). Chichester: Wiley.
- Lazarsfeld, P. F. (1948). The Use of Panels in Social Research. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 92(5), 405-410.
- Lazarsfeld, P. F., Berelson, B., & Gaudet, H. (1944). *The People's Choice. How the Voter Makes Up his Mind in a Presidential Campaign*. New York, London: Columbia University Press.
- Lengacher, J. E., Sullivan, C. M., Couper, M. P., & Groves, R. M. (1995). Once reluctant, always reluctant? Effects of differential incentives on later survey participation in a longitudinal study. *Proceedings of Survey Research Methods Section of the American Statistical Association*, 1029-1034.
- Lipps, O. (2007). Attrition in the Swiss Household Panel. *Methoden - Daten - Analysen*, 1(1), 45-68.
- Lynn, P. (2009). Methods for Longitudinal Surveys. In P. Lynn (Ed.), *Methodology of Longitudinal Surveys* (pp. 1-19). Chichester: Wiley.
- Schmitt-Beck, R., Rattinger, H., Roßteutscher, S., & Weßels, B. (2010). Die deutsche Wahlforschung und die German Longitudinal Election Study (GLES). In F. Faulbaum & C. Wolf (Eds.), *Gesellschaftliche Entwicklungen im Spiegel der empirischen Sozialforschung* (pp. 141-172). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Smith, P., Lynn, P., & Elliot, D. (2009). Sample Design for Longitudinal Surveys. In P. Lynn (Ed.), *Methodology of Longitudinal Surveys* (pp. 21-34). Chichester: Wiley.
- Trappmann, M. (2011). Weighting. In A. Bethmann & D. Gebhardt (Eds.), *User Guide "Panel Study Labour Market and Social Security" (PASS)* (pp. 51-61). Nürnberg: Research Data Center of the German Federal Employment Agency at the Institute for Employment Research.

## 7 Appendix



**Deutsche Wahlstudie**

**UNIVERSITÄT  
MANNHEIM**

**Ihre Teilnahme an der Deutschen Wahlstudie 2011  
– Ihre Meinung ist uns wichtig!**

Wir rufen Sie in den nächsten Tagen an und bitten um Ihre Teilnahme.

**Als Anerkennung Ihrer Mühe erhalten Sie ein Dankeschön im Wert von 5 Euro!**

Die wissenschaftliche Umfrage dauert nur 10 Minuten und hilft, die wahren politischen Ansichten der deutschen Bevölkerung zu erkennen. Wir danken Ihnen für Ihr Vertrauen!

**Bei Fragen stehen wir Ihnen gerne zur Verfügung:**  
Telefon: 0621/181-2896 (Dipl. Pol. Jan Eric Blumenstiel), Email: [wahlstudie@uni-mannheim.de](mailto:wahlstudie@uni-mannheim.de)



Mannheim, 30.09.2011

Sehr geehrte Frau

hiermit möchten wir Sie zu einer Befragung im Rahmen der *Deutschen Wahlstudie* einladen. Wir rufen Sie in den nächsten Tagen an und bitten um Ihre Teilnahme an einer ca. 10-minütigen Umfrage.

Ziel unserer wissenschaftlichen Studie ist es zu untersuchen, wie sich die politischen und gesellschaftlichen Meinungen in Deutschland langfristig verändern. Dazu ist es wichtig, dieselben Personen mehrmals zu befragen.

Die Teilnahme ist selbstverständlich freiwillig. Ihre Angaben werden streng vertraulich behandelt und nur anonymisiert ausgewertet. Zögern Sie nicht, uns bei Rückfragen zu kontaktieren.

Freundliche Grüße und herzlichen Dank

 **UNIVERSITÄT  
MANNHEIM**  
Prof. Dr. Hans Rattinger



FAKULTÄT FÜR SOZIALWISSENSCHAFTEN  
Lehrstuhl für Vergleichende Politische  
Verhaltensforschung  
Prof. Dr. Hans Rattinger

UNIVERSITÄT  
MANNHEIM

Universität Mannheim · Fakultät für Sozialwissenschaften  
Prof. Dr. Hans Rattinger · A5, 6 · 68131 Mannheim

Besucheradresse:  
Seminargebäude A 5  
D-68150 Mannheim

Ihr Ansprechpartner:  
Dipl. Pol. Jan Eric Blumenstiel  
Telefon 0621/181-2896  
wahlstudie@uni-mannheim.de

Mannheim, 10. November 2011

### Ihre Teilnahme an der Deutschen Wahlstudie

Sehr geehrter Herr

freundlicherweise haben Sie in der Vergangenheit an einer Befragung der Deutschen Wahlstudie teilgenommen. *Ihre Mitarbeit bei dieser Untersuchung war für uns sehr wertvoll*, dafür möchten wir Ihnen nochmals im Namen aller Beteiligten ganz herzlich danken!

Heute präsentieren wir Ihnen *ausgewählte Ergebnisse* unserer Studie. Sie können daraus ersehen, welche Meinungen die deutschen Wähler zu aktuellen politischen und gesellschaftlichen Fragen haben.

Die Deutsche Wahlstudie ist damit aber nicht zu Ende, denn unser Ziel ist es zu untersuchen, wie sich die politischen und gesellschaftlichen Meinungen in Deutschland langfristig verändern. Damit wir repräsentative Ergebnisse gewinnen können, die für die ganze Bevölkerung aussagekräftig sind, ist *Ihre erneute Teilnahme an einer kurzen Befragung für uns sehr wichtig*. Beachten Sie bitte, dass nur Sie persönlich teilnehmen dürfen, da wir dieselben Personen noch einmal befragen möchten.

Wir bitten Sie daher, den *beiliegenden Fragebogen sorgsam auszufüllen und in dem bereitgestellten Umschlag an uns zurück zu senden*. Sie werden dafür etwa 10 Minuten benötigen. Die Teilnahme an unserer Befragung ist selbstverständlich freiwillig. Ihre Angaben werden streng vertraulich behandelt und nur anonymisiert ausgewertet. Das Porto zahlt der Empfänger, so dass Ihnen keinerlei Kosten entstehen.

Als Anerkennung Ihrer Mühe erhalten Sie von uns ein *kleines Dankeschön im Wert von 5 Euro*. Sie können zwischen einem Gutschein des Versandhandels amazon.de oder einem Los der ARD-Fernsehlottarie wählen. Bitte kreuzen Sie Ihren Wunsch auf der Rückseite dieses Schreibens an und legen Sie bitte anschließend dieses Blatt dem Rückumschlag mit Ihrem ausgefüllten Fragebogen bei.

Oder *möchten Sie lieber online an unserer Umfrage teilnehmen?* Rufen Sie dafür bitte die Seite [www.deutsche-wahlstudie.de](http://www.deutsche-wahlstudie.de) auf und geben Sie dort Ihr persönliches Passwort ein: m1397

Wir bedanken uns zum Schluss noch einmal sehr herzlich für Ihre Mitarbeit und Ihr Vertrauen in unsere Arbeit. Zögern Sie nicht, uns bei Rückfragen zu kontaktieren.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen



Prof. Dr. Hans Rattinger

Die Deutsche Wahlstudie ist ein von der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) gefördertes wissenschaftliches Projekt der Universität Mannheim, der Universität Frankfurt, des Wissenschaftszentrums Berlin und von GESIS – Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften. Weitere Informationen erhalten Sie im Internet unter [www.gles.eu](http://www.gles.eu).

FAKULTÄT FÜR SOZIALWISSENSCHAFTEN  
Lehrstuhl für Vergleichende Politische  
Verhaltensforschung  
Prof. Dr. Hans Rattinger

UNIVERSITÄT  
MANNHEIM

Universität Mannheim - Fakultät für Sozialwissenschaften  
Prof. Dr. Hans Rattinger - AS, 6 - 68131 Mannheim

Mannheim, 7. Dezember 2011

**Wir bitten um Ihre Teilnahme an der Deutschen Wahlstudie! Ihre Meinung ist wichtig!**

Sehr geehrter Herr ,

vor einiger Zeit haben wir Sie zu einer schriftlichen Befragung im Rahmen der *Deutschen Wahlstudie* eingeladen. Haben Sie uns den Fragebogen bereits zurückgesandt? In diesem Fall danken wir Ihnen herzlich für Ihre Mühe und Ihr Vertrauen – Sie haben damit sehr zum Erfolg unserer Studie beigetragen.

Falls Sie noch nicht Gelegenheit hatten, den Fragebogen auszufüllen, bitten wir Sie, dies in den nächsten Tagen nachzuholen. Senden Sie uns den Fragebogen bitte einfach in dem bereitgestellten Kuvert zurück. Das Porto übernehmen selbstverständlich wir. Auf Wunsch senden wir Ihnen den Fragebogen auch gerne erneut zu.

Oder möchten Sie lieber online an unserer Umfrage teilnehmen? Rufen Sie dafür bitte die Seite [www.deutschewahlstudie.de](http://www.deutschewahlstudie.de) auf und geben Sie dort Ihr persönliches Passwort ein:

Ihre Teilnahme dauert nur 10 Minuten und hilft, die wahren politischen Ansichten der Bevölkerung zu erkennen.

Wir bedanken uns noch einmal sehr herzlich für Ihre Mitarbeit und Ihr Vertrauen in unsere Arbeit. Zögern Sie nicht, uns bei Rückfragen zu kontaktieren:

Tel.: 0621/181-2896 (Dipl. Pol. Jan Eric Blumenstiel)

Email: [wahlstudie@uni-mannheim.de](mailto:wahlstudie@uni-mannheim.de)

Mit freundlichen Grüßen



Prof. Dr. Hans Rattinger

